PTO/SB/21 (05-03)

Approved for use through 04/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM			Application-Number		09/614,961		
			Filing Date		July 13, 2000		
			First Named Inventor		Richard L. Antrim et al.		
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)			Art Unit		1623		
			Examiner Name		Howard Owens		
Total Number of Page	s In This Submission		Attorno	ey Docket Number	006401.00029		
ENCLO				(check all that apply)			
		ment Papers Application)		After Allowance Communication to Group			
Fee Attached		☐ Drawing(s)			Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences		
Amendment / Response		Licensing-related Papers		d Papers	Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)		
After Final		Petition			Proprietary Information		
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application			Status Letter		
Extension of Time Request		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address			Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):		
Dr		Terminal Disclalmer Request for Refund			Facsimile cover sheet, Continued of Economica Transmission.		
Information Disclosure Statement		CD, Number of CD(s)		CD(s)			
Certifled Copy of Priority Document(s)		Rema	Remarks Please charge any additional fees to deposit account number 19-0733.				
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application							
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53				,	·		
	SIGNA	TURE OF A	APPLICA	ANT, ATTORNEY, OF	RAGENT		
Firm or Individual name	Allen E. Hoover, Reg. No. 37,354						
Signature							
Date	n/4/03						
This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is fequired to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chlef Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.							

OFFICIAL

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of) REDUCED MALTO-) OLIGOSACCHARIDES	RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER
Antrim et al.)	CENTRAL FAX CENTER
0.:131)	DEC 0 9 2003 ·
Serial No.: 09/614,961 Filed: July 13, 2000) Attorney Docket: 006401.00029	
•) Group Art Unit: 1623	
) Examiner: Howard Owens	
Commissioner for Patents	·	
P O Box 1450		

RESPONSE

In response to the Office Action mailed September 9, 2003, please reconsider the application in light of the following remarks.

The Double Patenting Rejection

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer. It is noted that the '065 application has issued as U.S. patent 6,613,898.

Section 103 Rejection

Applicants submit that the Section 103 Rejection is not well founded. The Office Action states that "Borden teaches the catalytic hydrogenation of malto-oligosaccharide species..." This is simply not true. The Borden references directed towards the catalytic hydrogenation of polydextrose or polymaltose species, not malto-oligosaccharides.

The Office Action further points out that the hydrogenated polydextrose and polymaltose have certain improved properties such as improved color and so forth. The Office Action then asserts that this teaching somehow constitutes a suggestion of the invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. Polydextrose, polymaltose, and maltooligosaccharides are chemically distinct. The Borden reference is silent as to maltooligosaccharides or any other hydrogenated substrate except for a polymaltose or polydextrose. There is no teaching or suggestion in Borden to apply the teachings set forth therein to malto-oligosaccharides or any other chemical species.

Moreover, even if it could be said that Borden did provide such motivation, there is no teaching in Borden that any of the conditions set forth therein would actually work in connection with malto-oligosaccharides. In this respect, there are differences in

Application No. 09/614,961 Examiner: Howard Owens, Jr. Page 2

stability between maltodextrins and the chemicals disclosed by Borden. There is simply no suggestion that the catalytic hydrogenation disclosed by Borden would be at all suitable for malto-oligosaccharides. Thus, even assuming that a motivation was somehow found in the Borden reference, at most the Office Action has established that it is obvious to try the disclosure on malto-oligosaccharides. This motivation is insufficient to amount to a Section 103 Rejection.

In short, Borden is deficient, and a Section 103 Rejection cannot be premised thereon. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Application No. 09/614,961 Examiner: Howard Owens, Jr. Page 3

Conclusion

For these reasons, allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Allen E. Hoover Reg. No. 37,354

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd. 10 S. Wacker Dr. Suite 3000 Chicago, Illinois 60606 Telephone: 312-463-5000

Facsimile: 312-463-5001